

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

FRANCIS AKINRO

*

Plaintiff

*

v.

*

CIVIL ACTION NO. L-10-1491

CITY OF BALTIMORE;
BALTIMORE CITY POLICE
DEPARTMENT, et al.

*

*

Defendants

*

MEMORANDUM

Plaintiff, a resident of Baltimore, Maryland who holds himself out as a “Professor” and U.S. Department of Justice employee, filed this 28 U.S.C. § 1331 action on June 7, 2010, against the City of Baltimore and the Baltimore Police Department. His statement of facts alleges in toto that:

“Defendant hired Mrs. Ronke Omolewa living at Overton Drive before Beltway 695, Baltimore, Maryland 21206 to started arresting me by her policemen which are trillions in number. Mrs. Mary Caterer at 5138 Belair Road, Baltimore, Md. 21206, Mrs. Tracy at U.S. Post Office located at Manon Drive and Daddy Ropo who is Mrs. Mary Caterer’s husband have their standby army to invade and conquer the whole United States as how they conquer the whole Nigeria. Although they did not conquer Nigeria with their standby Armiee. Each of them have trillions of armiee which are like white and black America bodies ready to destroy the world.

Their intention is that they will kill me and use me as their traditional medicine they will use to conquer the whole world apart from their armies. They start from 1998 and arrest and process my real estate including my life belong inside the building to Igbe Niger and Benin, Ado and other part of Nigeria town as their personal. They arrest and confine me for seven years in order for them to achieve this. ”

Docket No. 1 at 2. In his relief request, Plaintiff seeks the award of \$497,000,000,000,000.00, the return of his “life belongings,” and the imposition of life imprisonment and the death penalty on various individuals based on “their aggravated circumstances.” Id. at 3.

Although Plaintiff's indigency application contains information the Court finds questionable, he shall be granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis.¹ This Court may preliminarily review the Complaint allegations before service of process and dismiss them sua sponte if satisfied that the Complaint has no factual or legal basis. See Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 324 (1989); see also Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992); Cochran v. Morris, 73 F.3d 1310, 1314 (4th Cir. 1996); Nasim v. Warden, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995). As explained by the Supreme Court in Neitzke: "Examples of [factually baseless lawsuits] are claims describing fantastic or delusional scenarios, with which federal district judges are all too familiar." Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. at 328.

Even when affording the pro se Complaint a generous construction, the Court finds no basis to allow the action to go forward or to require supplementation. Plaintiff's Complaint is replete with fanciful comments and is nonsensical. The action shall be summarily dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). A separate Order follows.

June 10, 2010

/s/

Benson Everett Legg
United States District Judge

¹ Plaintiff claims that he receives \$3,063.00 in monthly retirement income; has been employed by the U.S. Department of Justice since July of 2009; and has \$200,000.00 accumulated at four separate banks. Docket No. 2.